

### **REMARKS**

Claims 5, 7, 12 and 14 are amended. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, and 38 are cancelled. No claims are added. The amendments to the claims as indicated herein do not add any new matter to this application. Furthermore, amendments made to the claims as indicated herein have been made to exclusively improve readability and clarity of the claims and not for the purpose of overcoming alleged prior art. Thus, Claims 5, 7, 10-12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 25, 27, 30-32, 34, 36, 37, and 39-42 are pending in the application.

### **CLAIMS REJECTIONS—35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH**

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention. This objection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action alleges that, in Claim 12, the terminology “the input” has not been defined in claims upon which Claim 12 depends. Claim 12 has been amended to recite “in response to the selection of the first icon and second icon and the selection of a button from the set of logical operator buttons.” The amendment provides antecedent basis for the limitation in Claim 12. As a result, the objection has been overcome.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS—35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 21, 23, 24, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,966,126 (“*Szabo*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,366,299 (“*Lanning*”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,555,354 (“*Strasnick*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 7 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Szabo* in view of in view of *Lanning*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 10, 12, 30 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Szabo* in view of *Lanning* and further in view of U.S. Patent No 6,297,824 ("*Hearst*"). Claims 11 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Szabo* in view of *Lanning*, in view of *Hearst*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,668,966 ("*Ono*"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 14, 16, 17, 34, 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Szabo* in view of *Hearst*. Claims 18, 19, 38 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Szabo* in view of *Hearst*, and further in view of *Tuli*. Claims 20 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Szabo* in view of *Hearst*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,925,608 ("*Yost*"). Claims 41 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Szabo* in view of *Lanning*, in view of *Hearst* and further in view of *Neale*. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Each of the pending claims recites one or more elements that are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the cited art.

#### Claim 5

Claim 5 recites:

A method comprising:  
prior to executing a search query to perform a search, displaying a user interface on a display, the user interface displaying a graphical representation of the search query, the graphical representation including at least a numerical preview indication of an expected size of a dataset resulting from application of at least a portion of the query; and

wherein the displaying of the user interface includes at least displaying a graphical preview indication that is a visually distinct region located in a proximity to an icon representing a filter, the region having a thickness representative of an expected size of the dataset; and wherein the graphical preview indication is separate from the icon. (emphasis added)

At least the above-bolded portion of Claim 5 is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by *Szabo*, *Lanning*, and *Strasnick*, either alone or in combination.

Claim 5 recites “**displaying a graphical preview indication that is a visually distinct region located in a proximity to an icon representing a filter**” (emphasis added). The Office Action states that *Szabo* and *Lanning* do not teach or disclose a visually distinct region located in proximity to an icon but that *Strasnick* teaches this limitation. (Office Action, p. 7). More specifically, the Office Action asserts that “displaying a graphical preview indication that is a visually distinct region *located in a proximity to an icon representing a filter*” is disclosed in Fig. 2A, where each icon represents its own spatial region and is visually distinct from other icons in terms of thickness and value. However, Fig. 2A of *Strasnick* does not show a graphical preview indication in a visually distinct region *located in a proximity to an icon representing a filter*.

Fig. 2A in *Strasnick* displays symbols to represent a filing system. However, these symbols do not display both a graphical preview indication *and* an icon, much less the graphical preview located in a proximity to the icon. Rather, the Office Action states that each icon represents its own spatial region with each icon visually distinct from other icons in terms of thickness and value. Thus, the Office Action asserts that the icons of *Strasnick* are both the graphical preview indication that varies in thickness and value and the icon itself. Claim 5 recites “the graphical preview indication is separate from the icon.” Thus in Claim 5, two distinct objects are present, a graphical

preview indication, the first object, located in proximity to but separate from, an icon, the second object.

Furthermore, Claim 5 recites “*an icon representing a filter*.” *Strasnick* does not teach or disclose the use of icons representing filters in any instance. Rather, *Strasnick* teaches that icons may represent files and data in a file system, but not a filter.

As at least one element recited by Claim 5 is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by *Szabo*, *Lanning*, and *Strasnick*, either alone or in combination, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 5 is patentable over the cited art and is in condition for allowance.

#### Claim 7

Claim 7 recites:

A method comprising:

prior to executing a search query to perform a search, displaying a user interface on a display, the user interface displaying a graphical representation of the search query, the graphical representation including at least

a first graphical preview indication that is a first visually distinct region, having a first starting width and a first ending width, **the first visually distinct region being located in a proximity to a first icon representing a first filter, and the first ending width having a width that is representative of an expected size of a first dataset; wherein the first graphical preview indication is separate from the first icon** and

a second graphical preview indication that is a second visually distinct region, having a second starting width and a second ending width, **the second visually distinct region being located in a proximity to a second icon representing a second filter, the second ending width having a width that is representative of an expected size of a second dataset, the second visually distinct region being adjacent to the first visually distinct region, the width of the second starting width being equal to the first ending width; wherein the second graphical preview indication is separate from the second icon.** (emphasis added)

At least the above-bolded portion of Claim 7 is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by *Szabo* and *Lanning*, either alone or in combination.

Claim 7 recites “**the first visually distinct region being located in a proximity to a first icon representing a first filter, and the first ending width having a width that is representative of an expected size of a first dataset**” (emphasis added). The Office Action asserts that *Szabo* teaches “the first visually distinct region being located in a proximity to a first icon representing a first filter” in Fig. 9 and col. 20 lines 9-14. The Office Action alleges layer 101 to layer 100 of the pyramid in Fig. 9 represents a visually distinct region compared to other layers and layers 101 and 100 in themselves represent a first filter and an icon.

The pyramid in Fig. 9 of *Szabo* does not show a graphical preview indication in a visually distinct region located in a proximity to an icon representing a first filter. Claim 7 recites “a first graphical preview indication ... located in a proximity to a first icon.” Having layers 101 and 100 represent both the first graphical preview indication and the icon, as alleged in the Office Action, fails to teach or disclose the above recited limitation. In Claim 7, there are two distinct objects, a first graphical preview indication and a first icon. If the layers represent both the first graphical preview indication that is a visually distinct region and the filter, then there is only a single object and the limitation that the graphical preview indication is located in a proximity to an icon cannot be taught or disclosed.

Furthermore, Fig. 9 of *Szabo* discloses a pyramid with succeeding layers of representations that show *relevance rankings of a dataset*. The layers of the pyramid in *Szabo* and the graphical preview indication with differing widths in Claim 7 actually represent two completely different items. *Szabo* displays relevance rankings. The graphical preview indication in Claim 7 displays “an expected size of a dataset.” Thus, the pyramid and triangle outputs display only rankings or

the pertinence of relevance searches and not the size of the resultant dataset in a query. Also, these rankings occur after a set is already determined and so the pyramid output cannot display the expected amount in the dataset.

Claim 7 continues by reciting similar limitations with respect to a second graphical representation and a second icon that represents a second filter. The arguments stated with respect to the first graphical representation and the first icon and filter also apply to the second graphical representation and a second icon that represents a second filter.

As at least one element recited by Claim 7 is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by *Szabo* and *Lanning*, either alone or in combination, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 7 is patentable over the cited art and is in condition for allowance.

#### Claim 10

Claim 10 recites:

A method comprising:

prior to executing a search query to perform a search, displaying a user interface on a display, the user interface displaying a graphical representation of the search query, the graphical representation including at least:

a first icon representing a first filter associated with the search query, and  
a second icon representing a second filter associated with the search query;  
and

the user interface including at least a set of logical operator buttons, wherein each button is associated with a logical operator; and

**in response to a selection of the first icon and second icon and a selection of a button from the set of logical operator buttons, applying the logical operator associated with the selected button to the first icon and second icon.** (emphasis added)

At least the above-bolded portion of Claim 10 is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by *Szabo*, *Lanning*, and *Hearst*, either alone or in combination.

Claim 10 recites **“in response to a selection of the first icon and second icon and a selection of a button from the set of logical operator buttons, applying the logical operator associated with the selected button to the first icon and second icon”** (emphasis added). The Office Action states that *Szabo* and *Lanning* do not teach or disclose in response to a selection of the first icon and second icon and a selection of a button from the set of logical operator buttons and that *Hearst* teaches this limitation. (Office Action, p. 19). More specifically, the Office Action states that Fig. 13 and Fig. 15 in *Hearst* depict a selection of a first icon and second icon and a selection of a button from the set of logical operator buttons.

However, selecting 213b and 213c as the first and second icons and 222b as the logical operator from *Hearst* Fig. 15 does not apply the logical operator associated with the first and second icons. First, 213b and 213c from the Cat-a-Cone actually reflect a hierarchical structure that may be applied to a database. Thus, 213b and 213c do not represent a “graphical representation of a search query,” but rather a possible hierarchy that may be used.

Second, once 213b and 213c as the first and second icons and 222b as the logical operator are selected, nothing is performed by the application. One must click the search button before any action occurs. This is in opposition to Claim 10 which recites, “in response to a selection of the first icon and second icon and a selection of a button from the set of logical operator buttons, applying.” Thus, as soon as the selections are made, the logical operator is applied.

As at least one element recited by Claim 10 is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by *Szabo*, *Lanning*, and *Hearst*, either alone or in combination, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 10 is patentable over the cited art and is in condition for allowance.

Claim 14

Claim 14 recites:

A method comprising:

displaying a user interface on a display, the user interface displaying graphical representations of a search query, wherein at least one or more portions of the search query are divided into one or more query steps, each of the one or more query steps corresponding to a portion of the search query, each of the one or more query steps including one or more attributes;

receiving user input that specifies a value for one attribute of the one or more attributes of one query step of the one or more query steps; and

in response to the user input, performing an action on a portion of the search query corresponding to the one query step, the action being based on the value of the one attribute;

wherein the performing of the action includes independently disabling the one query step without removing the components of the one query step from the query representation, thereby disabling any portion of the search query corresponding to the one query step; and

**wherein the one or more query steps are a plurality of query steps that are arranged in an order, and the order is alterable by dragging to a new location and dropping a query step selected from the plurality of query steps.** (emphasis added)

At least the above-bolded portion of Claim 14 is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by *Szabo*, *Tuli*, and *Hearst*, either alone or in combination.

Claim 14 recites “**wherein the one or more query steps are a plurality of query steps that are arranged in an order, and the order is alterable by dragging to a new location and dropping a query step selected from the plurality of query steps**” (emphasis added). The Office Action states that *Szabo* and *Hearst* does not teach or disclose wherein the one or more query steps are a plurality of query steps that are arranged in an order, and the order is alterable by dragging to a new location and dropping a query step selected from the plurality of query steps



and that *Tuli* teaches this limitation. (Office Action, p. 29). This limitation was originally in Claim 18.

The Office Action alleges that Fig. 1 in *Tuli* teaches this limitation. More specifically, each icon in Fig. 1 represents a query step that is arranged in a group order that corresponds to topics that each file is related to. However *Tuli* fails to teach or disclose that the query steps are arranged in a specific order, much less that the order is alterable by dragging and dropping a query step to a new location. Rather, the Office Action alleges *Tuli* discloses query steps that may be dragged to a query area where logical operators may be applied. However, these query steps in the query area have no arranged order such that one relationship is performed prior to or after than another logical operator. The icons in *Tuli* are grouped together as a relation without displaying an order as shown in FIGs. 2-4. Thus no discrete query steps are displayed that may be re-arranged and as such, not every element of Claim 14 is taught or disclosed in *Tuli*.

As at least one element recited by Claim 14 is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by *Szabo*, *Tuli*, and *Hearst*, either alone or in combination, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 14 is patentable over the cited art and is in condition for allowance.

#### DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Claims 11, 12, and 41 are dependents of independent Claim 10. Claims 16, 17, 19, and 20 are dependents of independent Claim 14. These dependant claims also include the limitations of claims upon which they depend. These dependant claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependant claims depend are patentable. Thus reconsideration of the rejection on these claims is respectfully requested. Claims 25, 27, 30-32,

34, 36, 37, 39, 40, and 42 are the computer readable storage medium forms of Claims 5, 7, 10-12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 41 and should also be allowed.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker LLP

Dated: May 23, 2007

/RobertSChee/

Robert S. Chee

Reg. No. 58,554

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, California 95110-1083  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076